

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 18 2006


Remarks/Arguments:

1. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's rejection of new claim 17 as being unpatentable over Kemnitz et al. in view of Chartier. The examiner merely observes in hindsight that it would have been obvious to combine the replaceable threaded member disclosed in Chartier with the pneumatic puller of Kemnitz. However, there is no teaching, suggestion, or disclosure in Kemnitz for this supposedly obvious modification. In paragraphs 4 and 5 on page 2 of the action, the Examiner provides further speculative hindsight reasoning on why this combination is "obvious." But if it is obvious, why has the Examiner been unable to find prior art that discloses this obvious combination of replaceable threaded members to a dent puller?

The obvious answer is that this combination is not at all "obvious." In order to "find" this combination obvious, the Examiner must invoke purely speculative hindsight reasoning and apply it to a hypothetical person, i.e., "one skilled in the art." This puts an intolerable and impossible burden on the Applicant in so far as the Applicant must attempt to refute a wholly speculative assertion that turns on no factual matters. Indeed, with enough straining and creative reasoning, any combination of elements can be seen as an "obvious" combination in view of the prior art. Thus, it is not "obvious" to combine Chartier's threaded member with Kemnitz's pneumatic puller – except through the prism of all-to-easy hindsight reasoning. There is nothing in Kemnitz that suggests or teaches a replaceable threaded member, a u-shaped tool or a right-angled tool, and the Chartier reference was clearly available to Kemnitz. The Examiner's speculations about what elements in various references could possibly be combined cannot take precedence over what the references teach or do not teach.

2. In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw her rejection of claim 17 and allow claim 17 and pass the case to full issuance. No new subject matter has been added by this response.

Respectfully submitted,



Theresa M. Seal

Registration No.: 46,177